

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 17-34 are currently pending.

The Office Action rejected claims 17-22, 24 and 26-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by U.S. patent application publication no. 2005/0090611 (“Huffer”), claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Huffer in view of U.S. patent 6,677,293 (“Allgaier”), and claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Huffer in view of U.S. patent application publication no. 2004/0171759 (“Lange”). In view of the following comments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

The pending claims require the presence of a “polyisobutene block whose polyisobutene macromolecules have terminal double bonds to an extent of at least 50 mol%.” Thus, the claims require the presence of a significant amount of terminal double bonds associated with the polyisobutylene block. None of the applied art teaches or suggests this requirement, meaning that the applied art cannot teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Indeed, the Office Action does not assert that Huffer teaches or suggests this requirement. Rather, the Office Action merely points to par. [0101] which relates to the amount of vinylidene groups present. This disclosure does not relate in any way to terminal double bonds, but rather specifies the type of bond in Huffer’s compounds instead of the location of such bonds. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art, reading Huffer, would have no guidance or motivation whatsoever which would lead him or her to the claimed invention including the presence of a “polyisobutene block whose polyisobutene macromolecules have terminal double bonds to an extent of at least 50 mol%.”

The significance of this failure in Huffer’s disclosure is demonstrated in the examples of the present application. The examples demonstrate that the claimed compounds including the presence of a polyisobutene block whose polyisobutene macromolecules have terminal double bonds to an extent of at least 50 mol% significantly increase the efficiency of

Application No. 10/588,719  
Reply to Office Action dated November 28, 2008

surfactants in emulsions (by demonstrating the shifting of the X point when using the claimed compounds). Again, nothing in Huffer teaches or suggests the claimed compounds having significant terminal double bonding, or the significantly improved properties associated with such compounds.

Lange and Allgaier cannot compensate for these deficiencies. Neither of these references discloses or suggests modifying Huffer's compounds to yield a compound including the presence of a "polyisobutene block whose polyisobutene macromolecules have terminal double bonds to an extent of at least 50 mol%."

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.

Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance. Prompt and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Norman F. Oblon

Jeffrey B. McIntyre  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 36,867

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)